UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/661,404	09/11/2003	Robert Silva	IGT1P060X2/P000568-018	6650	
	7590 04/08/201 Villeneuve & Sampson	EXAMINER			
Attn: IGT	•	LEIVA, FRANK M			
P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3714		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/08/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/661,404	SILVA ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	FRANK M. LEIVA	3714		

	FRANK M. LEIVA	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	i, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the p	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		20 (
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better.	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation (Control of Control of Con		cted claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **	on a liam to Amaa a a daa a a to ()	OTOL 224)
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npliant Amendment (-10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-16,41 and 42. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea rand was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail: e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	itry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Dmitry Suhol/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new limitation contains the feature of "wireless communication manager adapted for managing wireless communications", which raises new issues that will require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the argument on page 6 of applicant's remarks: "The reliance on Lazzarotto does not remedy the deficiencies of Cole and Atwater. Furthermore, Lazzarotto (3:17-31) does not disclose a wireless communication manager adapted to configure a peripheral controller by assigning a communication identification key to the peripheral controller." The examiner clearly points that Lazzarotto's invention teaches of converting a wired USB system to a Wireless Bluetooth system and the assigning of a unique Identification key.

After considering the after final arguments the examiner deems the arguments not persuasive and the rejections still proper; The examiner conceded that neither Cole, Atwater or Lazzarotto alone discloses all the limitations, yet the applicant has failed to show a limitation foreign to all three prior art references that could not be combine to produce the predictable result of the present application. The request does not place the application in condition of allowance.